Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Kalispell Maintenance Headquarters Upgrades

Project Manager: Nicky Parson, NWM-PSB-2

Location: Flathead County, Montana

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.6 Additions and Modifications

to Transmission Facilities

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to upgrade portions of its Kalispell Maintenance Headquarters (MHQ) facility, located in Flathead County, Montana. The project would consist of four components: removal of an existing vehicle storage building; construction of a new vehicle storage building; installation of new landscaping in the MHQ building entrance area; and installation of a snow melt system at the four MHQ entry gates.

An existing vehicle storage building would be removed to provide a wider path for trucks and large vehicles moving between the rear and front of the MHQ property especially during snow removal activities. The existing building would be dismantled with the empty space repaved to match the existing paved yard.

A new vehicle storage building would be constructed about 50 feet east and at a right angle to the existing building. The new building site is currently a grass landscaped area on BPA property near the front entrance of the MHQ. This area was previously disturbed by placement of a sanitary sewer drainfield and water line (the drainfield would be removed prior to construction). The new building would be 36 feet wide by 122 feet long and look similar to the existing vehicle storage building. A new portion of security fence would be constructed around the new building to contain it within the MHQ yard.

New landscaping would be installed in existing planting areas in the front of the MHQ building and within the MHQ's security fence.

A new ice/snow melt system would be installed at the four MHQ security entrance gates. An embedded heating cable system approximately 4-foot wide (two feet on each side of gate centerline) by 24-foot long would be installed in the concrete slab beneath each gate.

All work would be within the boundaries of BPA's previously disturbed Kalispell MHQ facility. All equipment would be staged within the paved MHQ facility yard.

<u>Findings</u>: In accordance with Section 1021.410(b) of the Department of Energy's (DOE) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (57 FR 15144, Apr. 24, 1992, as amended at 61 FR 36221-36243, July 9, 1996; 61 FR 64608, Dec. 6, 1996, 76 FR 63764, Nov. 14, 2011), BPA has determined that the proposed action:

- (1) fits within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D (see attached Environmental Checklist);
- (2) does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal; and
- (3) has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion.

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

/s/ Tish Eaton

Tish Eaton
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason
Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

Date: December 11, 2017

Categorical Exclusion Environmental Checklist

This checklist documents environmental considerations for the proposed project and explains why the project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Action: Kalispell Maintenance Headquarters Upgrades

Project Site Description

BPA's Kalispell MHQ facility is fully developed with predominantly impervious and landscaped surfaces. The facility consists of the MHQ building, covered storage units, a vehicle wash bay, a vehicle storage building, an equipment storage area, and parking areas. The site is surrounded by industrial development.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

| | Environmental Resource Impacts | No Potential for Significance | No Potential for Significance, with Conditions |
|----|--|---|--|
| 1. | Historic and Cultural Resources | | |
| | Explanation: Background research shows that no project Area of Potential Effects (APE). The APE is wartificially leveled during building construction with place. The existing vehicle storage building propose the minimum eligibility requirements for listing on to historic properties determination made by BPA C further Section 106 consultation is required. | vithin an area that has imported fill deposits ed for removal, is less t the National Register o | been completely modified and located where landscaping would take than 50 years of age, and does not meet f Historic Places. No potential for effect |
| 2. | Geology and Soils | V | |
| | Explanation: Ground disturbance would occur in p | reviously disturbed ya | rd and landscaped area. |
| 3. | Plants (including federal/state special-status species) | | |
| | Explanation: All work in previously disturbed yard status plant species or habitat present. | and landscaped areas | ; no federally-listed or state special- |
| 4. | Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats) | | |
| | Explanation: All work in previously disturbed yard status wildlife species or habitat present. | and landscaped areas | ; no federally-listed or state special- |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs) | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : No water bodies or floodplains prese present. | ent. No federally-listed | or state special-status fish species |

| 6. | Wetlands | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | Explanation: None present. | | | | |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | V | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : No new wells or use of groundwater proposed; maximum depth of disturbance would be approximately four feet. | | | | |
| 8. | Land Use and Specially Designated Areas | V | | | |
| | Explanation: All work in existing yard and landscaped ar | eas. | | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | V | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : Modifications would not be noticeably different from existing conditions. The new vehicle storage building would look the same as the existing but in a different location. The new landscaping would improve the view of the MHQ from the entrance and from inside the building. | | | | |
| 10. | Air Quality | <u></u> | | | |
| | Explanation: Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions due to construction. | | | | |
| 11. | Noise | <u></u> | | | |
| | Explanation: Temporary construction noise during daylight hours. Operational noise would not change. | | | | |
| 12. | Human Health and Safety | <u></u> | | | |
| | Explanation: No known soil contamination or hazardous | conditions at project location. | | | |
| Evaluation of Other Integral Elements | | | | | |
| | Evaluation of Other In | itegral Elements | | | |
| | Evaluation of Other In expression of Pother In express | | exclusion. The | | |
| pro | e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in | tegral elements of the categorical e | | | |
| pro | e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in piect would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or secure the conditions are in the conditions. | tegral elements of the categorical e | | | |
| pro | e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in oject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, of health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ordo | tegral elements of the categorical error permit requirements for environmers. | ment, safety, and | | |
| pro | e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in oject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, whealth, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Order Explanation, if necessary: Require siting and construction or major expansion of we | tegral elements of the categorical error permit requirements for environmers. | ment, safety, and | | |
| pro | e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in oject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, whealth, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Order Explanation, if necessary: Require siting and construction or major expansion of we facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise or | tegral elements of the categorical enterprise or permit requirements for environments. Taste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded. | ment, safety, and treatment | | |

Involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species, unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and operated to prevent unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements, such as those of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institutes of Health.

Explanation, if necessary:

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: No notification. All work on BPA fee-owned property and no visual or other effects to adjacent landowners.

Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts to any environmentally sensitive resource.

Signed: <u>/s/ Tish Eaton</u> Date: <u>December 11, 2017</u>

Tish Eaton, ECT-4